

## **Remarks**

### **Drawings**

The Examiner has requested corrected drawings. The corrected drawing are submitted herewith.

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 13-17 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC 112 first paragraph as not being enabled. The Examiner states that while the invention is enabled for use with mice and rats, the invention is not enabled for any other animal other than mice or rats.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants agree with the Examiner that the invention is enabled for mice and rats and that there are no real technological questions unanswered by the disclosure that would prevent one skilled in the art from practicing the claimed invention on mice and rats. Likewise, there are no real technological questions unanswered by the disclosure that would prevent one skilled in the art from practicing the claimed invention on other rodents or even other mammals.

Use of the present invention may require one skilled in the art to take into account the particular characteristics of the animal being studied including, as the Examiner notes, the size of the particular animal relative to the area of exposure, the percent body fat and the presence or absence of fur. In order to carry out the invention, different mammals may require different specific protocols depending on the animal and what tissue or organ is being investigated. Specific protocols may differ even between different animals of the same species, depending on differences between the specific animals. Based on the disclosure provided, one skilled in the art can adjust a given protocol to account for the particular characteristics of an animal, and thereby practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation. The scope of applicant's claims should not be limited to the specific types of animals used in the Examples.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action states claim 13 is rendered vague by the use of the

phrase "portion of skin sufficient to expose the internal organ." The Examiner asks how much skin must be removed in order to expose an internal organ. Applicants have amended claim 13 to clarify the indefinite phrase.

Claim 15 is rendered indefinite by the phrase "wherein one or more dosages of said test agent are sequentially administered and the temperature of the organ for each dose is determined". The phrase has been amended to clarify the meaning of the claim. The typographical error "in" has been amended to read "is."

Claim 19 is rendered indefinite by use of the term "relative temperature." The term "relative" has been deleted from the claims for purposes of clarity.

Claims 19-22 are rendered indefinite by use of the phrase "removing mammalian skin overlaying the internal tissue or organ." The claim has been clarified by amending the phrase to read "exposure of the internal tissue of organ."

Claim 21 is rendered indefinite by use of the phrase "monitoring" and "one or more doses of the test agent are administered." The claim has been amended to overcome the rejection

Applicants submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance. Applicants request the rejections be withdrawn and request favorable reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted

2 July 2003  
Date

Michael M. Conger  
Michael M. Conger  
Attorney of Record, Reg. No. 43,562

GlaxoSmithKline  
Corporate Intellectual Property Department  
Five Moore Drive, PO Box 13398  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-3398  
Telephone: (919) 483-2474  
Facsimile: (919) 483-7988